

LAW OFFICE OF
DAVID J. WEINSOFF
138 Ridgeway Avenue
Fairfax, California 94930
tel. 415•460•9760 fax. 415•460•9762
weinsoff@ix.netcom.com

Via Certified Mailing - Return Receipt

February 13, 2014

Joanne Goeman
Ronald Goeman
Lisa Negrinelli
Owners and Operators
Shannon Quick, Registered Agent
Cerritos Yacht Anchorage, Inc.
Berth 205-C
1400 Anchorage Road
Wilmington, CA 90744

**Re: Notice of Violations and Intent to File Suit Under the Federal Water
Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act)**

Dear Owners, Operators, and Site Managers:

NOTICE

This Notice is provided on behalf of California River Watch ("River Watch") in regard to violations of the Clean Water Act ("CWA" or "Act") 33 U.S.C. § 1251 *et seq.*, that River Watch believes are occurring at the Cerritos Yacht Anchorage facility located at Berth 205-C, 1400 Anchorage Road in Wilmington, California (see Map, Attachment A). Notice is being sent to you as the responsible owners, operators, lessees, and/or managers of this facility and real property. This Notice addresses the violations of the CWA, including violation of the terms of the General California Industrial Storm Water Permit, and the unlawful discharge of pollutants from Cerritos Yacht Anchorage into Cerritos Channel.

CWA § 505(b) requires a citizen to give notice of the intent to file suit sixty (60) days prior to the initiation of a civil action under Section 505(a) of the Act. Notice must be given to the alleged violator, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA"), and the state in which the violations occur.

As required by the CWA, this Notice provides notice of the violations that have occurred, and continue to occur at the Cerritos Yacht Anchorage facility. Consequently, Cerritos Yacht Anchorage (the "Discharger") is placed on formal notice by River Watch that after the expiration of sixty (60) days from the date of this Notice, River Watch will be entitled to bring suit in the United States District Court against the Discharger for continuing violations of an effluent standard or limitation, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") permit condition or requirement, or Federal or State Order issued under the CWA (in particular, but not limited to, CWA § 301(a), § 402(p), and § 505(a)(1)), as well as the failure to comply with requirements set forth in the Code of Federal Regulations and the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board ("RWQCB") Water Quality Control Plan or "Basin Plan."

The CWA requires that any Notice regarding an alleged violation of an effluent standard or limitation or of an order with respect thereto shall include sufficient information to permit the recipient to identify the following:

1. *The specific standard, limitation, or order alleged to have been violated.*

To comply with this requirement, River Watch notices the Discharger of ongoing violations of the substantive and procedural requirements of CWA § 402(p) and violations of NPDES Permit No. CAS000001, State Water Resources Control Board Order No. 92-12-DWQ as amended by Order No. 97-03-DWQ (the "General Permit") relating to the boat repair and maintenance facility services at the Cerritos Yacht Anchorage site.

The Discharger filed a Notice of Intent ("NOI") agreeing to comply with the terms and conditions of the General Permit. The State Water Resources Control Board approved the NOI on or about September 30, 2003, and the Discharger was assigned Waste Discharger Identification ("WDID") number 4 19I018386. River Watch contends that in the operation of the Cerritos Yacht Anchorage facility, the Discharger has failed and is failing to comply with the terms and conditions of the General Permit requiring the preparation, implementation, review and update of an adequate Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan ("SWPPP"), the elimination of all non-authorized storm water discharges, and the development and implementation of an adequate monitoring and reporting program.

Compliance with the monitoring and reporting program is central to the effectiveness of the General Permit program. The Discharger, however, has failed and is failing to comply with the following General Permit requirements as detailed in the Annual Reports submitted in reporting years 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012.¹

¹The 2012-2013 Annual Report was not included in the documents provided by the RWQCB to River Watch in response to its November 21, 2013 Public Records Act request.

- a. Sampling and Analysis Results Were Incorrectly Provided in the 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012 Annual Reports.

The Annual Report form, in the Section titled *Specific Information*, “Monitoring and Reporting Program,” E. Sampling and Analysis Results, identifies the following violations: Subparagraph 1 requires non-exempt Dischargers to state whether sampling data was obtained from two storm events during the applicable July 1 through June 30 reporting period, or to explain why fewer samples were taken. None of the Annual Reports filed by the Discharger provide sampling from two storm events, and the variety of explanations provided – insufficient rain, lack of rain, rain outside the reporting parameters established under the General Permit – are not supported by publicly available records of precipitation occurring in the geographic area where the Cerritos Yacht Anchorage facility is located.²

Subparagraphs 3 through 5 address the storm water discharge locations at the Cerritos Yacht Anchorage facility. The Discharger’s SWPPP, prepared in December 2003 and revised in November 2007, identifies 7 locations³; the 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011 Annual Reports identify 7 locations; and the 2011-2012 Annual Report identifies 5 locations. No Annual Report includes sampling data from all required sampling locations:⁴

- The 2008-2009 Annual Report states that “[s]amples will be collected of facility water at Discharge Points #1 and #2.” Sampling reduction under the General Permit, as stated in Subparagraph 5 of the Annual Report form, is permitted under the terms of Section B.7.d, and requires “documentation supporting your determination that two or more drainage areas are substantially identical. “No required “documentation” was provided by the Discharger in the Annual Report, and the 2007 SWPPP does not establish a reduced number of discharge locations.
- The 2009-2010 Annual Report states that the samples from “Discharge Points #1 and #2 [are] combined for analysis.” Sampling reduction under the General Permit, as stated in Subparagraph 5 of the Annual Report form, is permitted under the terms of

² Cerritos Yacht Anchorage is an unfenced facility that, in addition to performing boat repair and maintenance operations, remains open to allow boat owners to enter and conduct their own repair and maintenance work on the site outside of traditional business hours.

³ 11/07 Revised SWPPP, Section B, Subsections 1.1-1.7, pages 62-63, “Facility Discharge Points”.

⁴ The March 22, 2012 “Industrial Storm Water Inspection Report” conducted by U.S. EPA contractor PG Environmental, LLC stated in its “Inspection Findings” that “5. The Permittee’s Monitoring Program was not in accordance with the sampling location requirements specified by Section B.7 of the Permit. Specifically, the Permittee’s sample collection locations did not include all drainage areas that represent the quality and quantity of the Facility storm water discharges ...”.

Section B.7.d, and requires “documentation supporting your determination that two or more drainage areas are substantially identical. “No required “documentation” was provided by the Discharger in the Annual Report, and the 2007 SWPPP does not establish a reduced number of discharge locations.

- The 2010-2011 Annual Report does not include any sampling data from any discharge locations.
- The 2011-2012 Annual Report states that the “5 discharge points were reduced to 1 pursuant to Section B.7.a of the Permit” and “[s]ample collection was reduced in accordance with Section B.7.a.” Sampling reduction under the General Permit, as stated in Subparagraph 5 of the Annual Report form, is only permitted under the terms of Section B.7.d, and requires “documentation supporting your determination that two or more drainage areas are substantially identical. “No required “documentation” was provided by the Discharger in the Annual Report, and the 2007 SWPPP does not establish a reduced number of discharge locations.

Subparagraph 10 specifically states that “Section B.5 of the General Permit requires you to analyze storm water for pH, Total Suspended Solids (TSS), Specific Conductance (SC), Total Organic Carbon (TOC) or Oil and Grease (O&G), other pollutants likely to be present in storm water discharges in significant quantities ...” The requirement to identify “potential pollutants that could be discharged in storm water discharges or authorized non-storm water discharges” is also mandated under Section A.6 of the General Permit governing the preparation of the Discharger’s SWPPP.

The 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2011-2012 Annual Reports contain sampling for pH, TSS, SC, TOC, and O&G – the core set of pollutants that must be sampled by all industrial facilities covered under the General Permit. Sampling for additional “potential pollutants,” however, was only conducted for reporting years 2008-2009 and 2009-2010. The Discharger identified the following sampling violations in its three Annual Reports:

- In 2008-2009, the Discharger exceeded the “EPA Benchmarks” for TSS (210 mg/L) and SC (424 μ mhos/cm). The Discharger also identified and sampled for the “potential pollutants” copper, lead, nickel, aluminum, iron, and tin, exceeding the “EPA Benchmarks” for copper (0.595 mg/L), aluminum (1.70 mg/L), and iron (2.46 mg/L).⁵

⁵ These violations are specifically detailed in the RWQCB’s March 17, 2010 “Annual Report Review – Benchmark Value Exceedance: NPDES General Permit (Permit) For Storm Water Discharges Associated With Industrial Activity (Order No. 97-03 DWQ; NPDES No. CAS000001), WDID# 419I018386.” The applicable EPA “Benchmarks” for the these listed pollutants are: SC 200 μ mhos/cm; TSS100 mg/L; aluminum 0.75mg/L; iron 1.0 mg/L; and copper 0.0636 mg/L.

- In 2009-2010, the Discharger identified and sampled for the “potential pollutants” copper, lead, aluminum, and iron, exceeding the “EPA Benchmark” for copper (0.0708 mg/L).
- In 2011-2012, the Discharger exceeded the “EPA Benchmark” for SC (615 µmhos/cm). The Discharger failed to identify and sample for any “potential pollutants.”

The Discharger, in addition to the alleged violations above, has failed and is failing to sample for zinc, a common toxic metal found in the regular course of boat repair and maintenance activities conducted at the Cerritos Yacht Anchorage facility, and other “potential pollutants” specifically identified in the Discharger’s SWPPP.⁶

- b. Corrective Action Taken for Incidents of Noncompliance are Implemented for the 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012 Annual Reporting Years.

The Annual Report form, in the Section titled *Specific Information*, “Annual Comprehensive Site Compliance Evaluation (ACSCE),” I. ACSCE Evaluation Report, requires “[t]he facility operator ... to provide an evaluation report that includes ... any incidents of non-compliance and the corrective actions taken.” The Discharger allegedly failed and is failing to identify and correct the deficiencies in Section “E” of the Annual Reports as detailed above.

- c. Certification of Compliance With General Permit Improperly Cited in the 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012 Annual Reporting Years.

The Annual Report form, in the Section titled *Specific Information*, “Annual Comprehensive Site Compliance Evaluation (ACSCE),” J. ACSCE Certification requires facilities covered under the General Permit to state “[b]ased on your ACSCE, do you certify compliance with the Industrial Activities Storm Water General Permit?” On each Annual Report the Discharger states “Yes.” The alleged failures to fully and accurately ensure compliance with the requirements of the General Permit as detailed above contradict both the ACSME Certification” and the signed “Annual Report Certification,” which provides that

⁶ The SWPPP identifies zinc as a possible pollutant at the Cerritos Yacht Anchorage facility. (11/07 Revised SWPPP, Section A, Subsection 5.0, page 50, “BMP Summary Table By Area/Activity”.) The SWPPP also lists “Additional Tests Based on Conditions on the Site,” identifying chemical oxygen demand, copper, nickel, lead, zinc, aluminum, iron, tin cadmium, chromium, volatile organic carbons. (11/07 Revised SWPPP, Section B, Subsection 5.2.2, page 78, “Additional Tests”.) The SWPPP also includes a “Storm Water Sample Analysis” form for the Discharger to both list “sample results” for chemical oxygen demand, aluminum, copper, iron, and lead, and to provide a narrative as to the “possible pollutant source” and BMP modification/addition. 11/07 Revised SWPPP, Section C, “Storm Water Analysis Evaluation”.)

the signer of the Annual Report attests that the “information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate and complete.”

2. *The activity alleged to constitute a violation.*

The Discharger’s full-service boat repair and maintenance operations (as classified in the NOI and Annual Reports under SIC Code 3732) include, but are not limited to, scraping and bottom painting, fiberglass and gelcoat application and repair. Repair and maintenance of vessels is done on-site by Eddie’s Marine Service or by boat owners themselves. The Discharger’s SWPPP states that “[r]epairs are made to boats in the dry-dock area in the western section of the site. Here boats are prepared for painting and treatment, including processes such as paint scraping, stripping, torching, and sanding.”⁷ The work at the Cerritos Yacht Anchorage facility is conducted primarily outdoors⁸, in the facility dry-dock area and on water in the facility slips, all in close proximity to the navigable waters of Cerritos Channel. Because the property on which the Cerritos Yacht Anchorage facility is located is subject to rain events, the fact that “there is no on-flow, of storm or non-storm water, from adjoining areas onto the site,”⁹ and because there is no RWQCB exemption from fully collecting and analyzing the range of pollutants identified above, there can be a discharge of these pollutants to Cerritos Channel.

To properly regulate these activities and control the discharge of these types of pollutants, the State Water Resources Control Board requires industrial facilities to obtain and comply with the terms and conditions of an individual NPDES permit or seek coverage under the General Permit (or obtain a proper exemption under the terms of the General Permit from its requirements). Review of the public record by River Watch reveals that the Discharger obtained coverage under the General Permit but fails to comply with its environmentally protective requirements, in particular the implementation of effective BMPs, and compliance with the critically important sampling and comprehensive annual reporting requirement.

River Watch, in addition to alleging illegal storm water discharges, alleges the Discharger is discharging non-storm water from its facility that is not authorized under the General Permit, in violation of CWA § 301(a). These discharges, which require an NPDES permit, include discharges from the power-washing of equipment and vessels, painting and

⁷ 11/07 Revised SWPPP, Section A, Subsection 4.1, “Boat Repair and Dry-Dock Storage Yards,” page 37.

⁸ The SWPPP states that 90% of the work is conducted outdoors, and 98% of the 111,787 square foot facility site is impervious to storm water. (11/07 Revised SWPPP, Section A, Subsection 2.7, “Physical Description,” page 11).

⁹ 11/07 Revised SWPPP, Section A, Subsection 4.12, “Water On-Flow,” page 49.

fiberglass/gelcoat repair activities that allow the discharge (via surface water and drift) of pollutants to waters of the United States.

3. *The person or persons responsible for the alleged violation.*

The persons responsible for the alleged violations are Joanne and Ronald Goeman, and/or those persons who are the owners and operators of Cerritos Yacht Anchorage and Cerritos Yacht Anchorage, collectively referred to herein as the Discharger.

4. *The location of the alleged violation.*

The location of the various violations is the permanent address of the Cerritos Yacht Anchorage facility at Berth 205-C, 1400 Anchorage Road in Wilmington, Los Angeles County, California, including the adjoining waters of Cerritos Channel B a water of the United States.

5. *The date or dates of violation or a reasonable range of dates during which the alleged activity occurred.*

The range of dates covered by this Notice is from February 13, 2009 to February 13, 2014. River Watch will from time to time further update this Notice to include all violations which occur after the range of dates covered by this Notice. Some of the violations are continuous in nature, therefore each day constitutes a violation.

6. *The full name, address, and telephone number of the person giving notice.*

The entity giving notice is California River Watch, 290 S. Main Street, #817, Sebastopol, CA 95472 – a non-profit corporation organized under the laws of the State of California, dedicated to protect, enhance and help restore the groundwater and surface water environs of California including, but not limited to, its rivers, creeks, streams, wetlands, vernal pools, and tributaries.

River Watch may be contacted via email: US@ncriverwatch.org, or through its attorneys. River Watch has retained legal counsel with respect to the issues set forth in this Notice. All communications should be addressed to:

David Weinsoff, Esq.
Law Office of David Weinsoff
138 Ridgeway Avenue
Fairfax, CA 94930
Tel. 415-460-9760
Fax. 707-528-8675

STATUTORY BACKGROUND

CWA § 301(a), 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a), prohibits the discharge of any pollutant into waters of the United States unless such discharge is in compliance with various enumerated sections of the Act. Among other things, Section 301(a) prohibits discharges not authorized by, or in violation of, the terms of an individual NPDES permit or a general NPDES permit issued pursuant to CWA § 402(p), 33 U.S.C. § 1342. CWA § 402(p), 33 U.S.C. § 1342(p), establishes a framework for regulating storm water discharges under the NPDES program. States with approved NPDES permitting programs are authorized under this section to regulate storm water discharges through permits issued to dischargers and/or through the issuance of a single, statewide general permit applicable to all storm water dischargers. Pursuant to CWA § 402, the Administrator of the U.S. EPA has authorized California's State Water Resources Control Board to issue NPDES permits including general NPDES permits in California.

The State Water Resources Control Board elected to issue a statewide general permit for industrial discharges, and issued the General Permit on or about November 19, 1991, modified the General Permit on or about September 17, 1992, and reissued the General Permit on or about April 17, 1997, pursuant to CWA § 402(p).

In order to discharge storm water lawfully in California, industrial dischargers must comply with the terms of the General Permit or have obtained an individual NPDES permit and complied with its terms.

The General Permit contains certain absolute prohibitions. Discharge Prohibition Order Section A(1) of the General Permit prohibits the direct or indirect discharge of materials other than storm water ("non-storm water discharges"), which are not otherwise regulated by a NPDES permit, to waters of the United States. Discharge Prohibition Order Section A(2) prohibits storm water discharges and authorized non-storm water discharges that cause or threaten to cause pollution, contamination, or nuisance. Receiving Water Limitation Order Section C(1) prohibits storm water discharges to any surface or groundwater that adversely impact human health or the environment. Receiving Water Limitation Order Section C(2) prohibits storm water discharges that cause or contribute to an exceedance of any applicable water quality standards contained in a Statewide Water Quality Control Plan or the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board Basin Plan.

In addition to absolute prohibitions, the General Permit contains a variety of substantive and procedural requirements that dischargers must meet. Facilities discharging, or having the potential to discharge, storm water associated with industrial activity that have not obtained an individual NPDES permit must apply for coverage under the General Permit

by filing a NOI. The General Permit requires existing dischargers to file NOIs before March 30, 1992.

Dischargers must also develop and implement a SWPPP which must comply with the standards of BAT and BCT. The SWPPP must, among other requirements:

- Identify and evaluate sources of pollutants associated with industrial activities that may affect the quality of storm and non-storm water discharges from the facility and identify and implement site-specific BMPs to reduce or prevent pollutants associated with industrial activities in storm water and authorized non-storm water discharges [Permit Section A(2)]. BMPs must implement BAT and BCT [Permit Section B(3)].
- Include a description of individuals and their responsibilities for developing and implementing the SWPPP [Permit Section A(3)]; a site map showing the facility boundaries, storm water drainage areas with flow pattern and nearby water bodies, the location of the storm water collection, conveyance and discharge system, structural control measures, impervious areas, areas of actual and potential pollutant contact, and areas of industrial activity [Permit Section A(4)]; a list of significant materials handled and stored at the site [Permit Section A(5)]; and, a description of potential pollutant sources including industrial processes, material handling and storage areas, dust and particulate generating activities, and a description of significant spills and leaks, a list of all non-storm water discharges and their sources, and a description of locations where soil erosion may occur [Permit Section A(6)].
- Include a narrative assessment of all industrial activities and potential pollutant sources at the facility [Permit Section A(7)]. Include a narrative description of the BMPs to be implemented at the facility for each potential pollutant and its source, and consider both non-structural BMPs (including "Good Housekeeping") and structural BMPs where non-structural BMPs are not effective [Permit Section A(8)].
- Conduct one comprehensive site compliance evaluation by the facility operator in each reporting period (July 1- June 30), with SWPPP revisions made, as appropriate, and implemented within 90 days of the evaluation [Permit Section A(9)].

The General Permit requires dischargers to eliminate all non-storm water discharges to storm water conveyance systems other than those specifically set forth in Special Condition D(1)(a) of the General Permit and meeting each of the conditions set forth in Special Condition D(1)(b).

As part of their monitoring program, dischargers must identify all storm water discharge locations that produce a significant storm water discharge, evaluate the effectiveness of BMPs in reducing pollutant loading, and evaluate whether pollution control

measures set out in the SWPPP are adequate and properly implemented. Dischargers must conduct visual observations of these discharge locations for at least one storm per month during the wet season (October through May) and record their findings in their Annual Report [Permit Section B(14)]. Dischargers must also collect and analyze storm water samples from at least two storms per year in compliance with the criteria set forth in Permit Section B(5). Dischargers must also conduct dry season visual observations to identify sources of non-storm water pollution in compliance with Permit Section B(7).

Permit Section B(14) of the General Permit requires dischargers to submit an "Annual Report" by July 1 of each year to the executive officer of the relevant Regional Water Quality Control Board. Permit Section A(9)(d) of the General Permit requires the dischargers to include in the annual report an evaluation of the dischargers' storm water controls, including certifying compliance with the General Permit. *See also* Permit Sections C(9), C(10) and B(14).

The EPA has established Parameter Benchmark Values ("EPA Benchmarks") as guidelines for determining whether a facility discharging storm water has implemented the requisite BAT and BCT. (65 Fed. Reg. 64746, 64767 (Oct. 30, 2000)). California Toxics Rule ("CTR") limitations are also applicable to all non storm water and storm water discharges. (40 C.F.R. part 131).

The RWQCB has established applicable water quality standards. This Basin Plan includes a narrative toxicity standard and a narrative oil and grease standard. The Basin Plan provides that "[w]aters shall not contain suspended material in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses." The Basin Plan establishes limits on metals, solvents, pesticides and other hydrocarbons.

VIOLATIONS

River Watch contends that between February 13, 2009 and February 13, 2014 the Discharger violated the CWA, the Basin Plan and the Code of Federal Regulations by discharging pollutants from the Cerritos Yacht Anchorage facility to waters of the United States without an individual NPDES permit, or in violation of the General Permit.

The violations discussed herein are derived from eye witness reports and records publicly available, or records in the possession and control of the Discharger. Furthermore, River Watch contends these violations are continuing.

As discussed above, the Discharger has failed and is failing to consistently sample for the full range of pollutants mandated by the General Permit.

Finally, River Watch also believes that the Cerritos Yacht Anchorage site is not operated to ensure that storm and non-storm water discharges are properly contained,

controlled, and/or monitored. As a result, the Discharger fails to follow the requirements of the General Permit in its sampling protocols for the Cerritos Yacht Anchorage facility by

failing to accurately capture “first flush” samples and failing to properly sample from all the outfalls of the facility.

REMEDIAL MEASURES REQUESTED

River Watch believes that implementation of the following remedial measures are necessary in order to bring the Discharger into compliance with the CWA and reduce the biological impacts of its non-compliance upon public health and the environment surrounding the facility:

1. Prohibition of the discharges of pollutants including, but not limited to, petroleum hydrocarbons, sulfuric acid, lead, oil and grease, anti-freeze, solvents, paints, heavy metals (including aluminum, iron, lead, copper and zinc), soaps, sediment, biodegradable organic matter, sanitary waste, bacteria, and organics from the vessel repair and maintenance activities.
2. Compliance with the terms and conditions of the General Permit, and BMPs detailed in the EPA’s “Industrial Stormwater Fact Sheet Series, Sector R: Ship and Boat Building or Repair Yards” (EPA Office of Water, EPA-833-F-06-033, December 2006;(www.epa.gov/npdes/pubs/sector_r_shipbuilding.pdf.).
3. Compliance with the storm water sampling, monitoring and reporting requirements of the General Permit.
4. Sampling of storm water at least four (4) times per year over each of the next five (5) years: at “first flush”; the first significant rain after “first flush”; the first significant rain after April 1; and the second significant rain after April 1.
5. 100% of the discharge from the Cerritos Yacht Anchorage site and facility must be discharged through discrete conveyances.
6. Any discharge from the Cerritos Yacht Anchorage site and facility to a water of the United States must be sampled during the four (4) sampling events identified in paragraph #4 above.
7. Preparation and submittal to the RWQCB of a “Reasonable Potential Analysis” for the Cerritos Yacht Anchorage site and its operations.
8. Preparation of an updated SWPPP including a monitoring program, with a copy provided to River Watch.

CONCLUSION


CWA § 505(a)(1) and 505(f) provide for citizen enforcement actions against any "person," including individuals, corporations, or partnerships, for violations of NPDES permit requirements and for un-permitted discharges of pollutants. 33 U.S.C. §§ 1365(a)(1) and (f), § 1362(5). An action for injunctive relief under the CWA is authorized by 33 U.S.C. § 1365(a). Violators of the Act are also subject to an assessment of civil penalties of up to \$37,500 per day/per violation for all violations pursuant to Sections 309(d) and 505 of the Act, 33 U.S.C. §§ 1319(d), 1365. *See also* 40 C.F.R. §§ 19.1-19.4.

The violations set forth in this Notice effect the health and enjoyment of members of River Watch who reside and recreate in the affected community. Members of River Watch use the affected watershed for recreation, sports, fishing, swimming, hiking, photography, nature walks and the like. Their health, use and enjoyment of this natural resource is specifically impaired by the Discharger's violations of the CWA as set forth in this Notice.

River Watch believes this Notice sufficiently states grounds for filing suit. At the close of the 60-day notice period or shortly thereafter River Watch has cause to file a citizen's suit under CWA § 505(a) against the Discharger for the violations of the CWA described in this Notice.

During the 60-day notice period, River Watch is willing to discuss effective remedies for the violations identified in this Notice. However, if the Discharger wishes to pursue such discussions in the absence of litigation, it is suggested those discussions be initiated soon so that they may be completed before the end of the 60-day notice period. River Watch does not intend to delay the filing of a lawsuit if discussions are continuing when the notice period ends.

Very truly yours,



David Weinsoff

DW:lhbm

cc: Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D.C. 20460

Regional Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

Executive Director
State Water Resources Control Board
P.O. Box 100
Sacramento, CA 95812

Executive Officer
Regional Water Quality Control Board
Los Angeles Region
320 West 4th Street / Suite 200
Los Angeles, CA 90013